



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

41

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,472	10/17/2003	Alan B. Mead	1005.1009	3003
31814	7590	05/18/2007		
SCOTT T. GRIGGS 901 MAIN STREET SUITE 6300 DALLAS, TX 75202			EXAMINER TO, TUAN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3663	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/688,472	Applicant(s) MEAD ET AL.	
	Examiner Tuan C. To	Art Unit 3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-16 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8, 9 and 37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6 and 11-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of claims 2-6, and 10-16 upon the elected species B and species Bi in the reply filed on 03/2/07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there is no serious burden on the Examiner.

The applicant's argument is not persuasive since the patentably distinct species exists in the application that show more than one invention is claimed. Clearly, a burden exists when more than one invention is claimed and requires numerous class/subclass searches.

The restriction to claim 1 has been withdrawn.

An action on claims 1-6, and 10-16 follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 3663

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 2-6, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowlds (US 6462702B1) and in view of Greneker, III et al. (US 5917430A).

With respect to claims 2-6, Bowlds discloses a system/method of warning the law enforcement officers about the potential collision of the moving target (vehicle) traveling in the same direction with the patrol vehicle (Bowlds, column 3, lines 1-8) via a radar system. Said system/method comprises a Doppler based radar system (10) for use in monitoring the speed of moving target vehicle as well as determining whether determine the direction of the patrol vehicle. Bowlds further teaches: "determining the pattern of speed variation of the primary vehicle during a predetermined time interval" (Bowlds, column 6, lines 45-53), "determining the state of the transmission of the primary vehicle during said predetermined time interval" (Bowlds, abstract; column 6, lines 55-65).

Bowlds does not disclose the following: "generating an alert to the operator of the primary vehicle when (1) the said pattern correspond to a predetermined pattern indicative of a particular driving maneuver, (2) the said one or more parameters of the

Art Unit: 3663

state of movement of the closing vehicle are at a predetermined status; and/or (3) another condition exists”.

The radar based highway safety warning system as taught in Greneker et al. generating a alert to the operator of the a police vehicle when there is indicative of a particular driving maneuver, when one or more parameters of the movement of the vehicle ahead is closed to the police vehicle, and when there is a particular driving situation (column 4, lines 60-67; column 5, lines 8-17). Greneker et al. do not specific teach a particular maneuver such as a U-turn, but the radar system as taught in Greneker et al. is implement to generate alert to an operator when a dangerous situation is going to occur.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Bowlds to include the teachings of Greneker, III et al. so that an authorized agent who is on a duty can quickly reach a target vehicle or place while the safety is still maintained during different driving situations.

With regard to claim 11, Bowlds discloses that the primary vehicle is a highway patrol vehicle (Bowlds, column 3, lines 1-8).

With regard to claim 12, Bowlds discloses that “determining the pattern of speed variations of the primary vehicle during a predetermined time interval is performed by a police radar unit” (Bowlds, column 5, lines 40-43, Doppler radar system 10).

With regard to claim 13, Bowlds further disclose that the radar system includes an oscillator for generating a signal and an antenna that transmits the signal to a target vehicle traveling in the same direction with the patrol vehicle (Bowlds, abstract).

With regard to claim 14, Bowlds teaches that the parameter about the state of the movement of the closing vehicle, which is the speed of the target vehicle, is detected by the Doppler radar system onboard the patrol vehicle.

With regard to claims 15 and 16, Greneker, III et al teaches that the alert is generated to the police officer via an interface (figure 1).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 1 is allowable since none of the prior art teaches determining the presence of a U-turn pursuit maneuver by monitoring the primary vehicle for a relatively sudden slowing of primary vehicle velocity from a first velocity to a second velocity followed by a subsequent velocity increase from the second velocity to a third velocity, wherein the third velocity is greater than or equal to the first velocity and the first velocity is greater than the second velocity.

Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-6, and 11-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusions


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan C To whose telephone number is (571) 272-6985. The examiner can normally be reached on from 8:00AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. To', is written over a horizontal line.

Application/Control Number: 10/688,472

Page 7

Art Unit: 3663

Tuan C To

May 4, 2007